

**New York Tribune**  
First to Last—the Truth: News—  
Editorials—Advertisements  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1916.  
Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation.  
Editor: Walter Dill Scott.  
Managing Editor: Charles C. Smith.  
Business Manager: William C. Sullivan.  
Address: 110 Nassau Street, New York.  
Telephone: Beckman 3000.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:**  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo., \$3.00; 3 mos., \$8.00; 6 mos., \$15.00; 1 year, \$28.00.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo., \$3.00; 3 mos., \$8.00; 6 mos., \$15.00; 1 year, \$28.00.  
Daily only, 1 mo., \$2.00; 3 mos., \$5.00; 6 mos., \$9.00; 1 year, \$16.00.  
Sunday only, 1 mo., \$1.00; 3 mos., \$2.50; 6 mos., \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.  
Entered as Second-Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

**British Losses**

The statement of British losses for the first four months of the 'Somme' drive has succeeded in making a real impression upon the writers of headlines and the amateur critics of military affairs largely because the earlier losses of the French and Germans have been forgotten. Actually the British losses are not impressive when contrasted with those suffered by the nations who entered the war with conscript armies.

The losses of the Germans in the first four months of severe fighting, September, October, November and December, 1914, were 842,400, as shown by the official German lists. As the British losses at the Somme in the four months period of July, August, September and October, 1916, were only 415,000, it is clear that they cannot be excessive.

This comparison can be even more clearly shown by putting the losses in tables: Thus:

German Losses	British Losses
1914	1916
September, 125,000	July, 59,000
October, 279,800	August, 128,000
November, 235,300	September, 120,000
December, 201,900	October, 108,000
	842,400
	415,000

For the first four months of active fighting the German loss was at the rate of 210,000. The British monthly rate for the Somme has been 104,000. In the first five months of the war German casualties amounted to 1,005,000, as shown by the German lists. Up to date the British total loss has been 1,119,000. Thus Germany lost in five months almost as many men as Great Britain has lost in twenty-seven.

Of course the explanation is found in the fact that not until July 1 did Britain have a large army in the field and actively operating—that is, large by comparison with France or Germany—and her force is still numerically greatly inferior to either.

In the first twelve months of war the total German casualties were over 1,800,000. A minimum calculation of the monthly rate of wastage in this period, made in Copenhagen, was 152,000. In this time the French loss was not materially smaller. For the twenty-seven months of the war the most conservative figures do not place the total German casualties below 4,000,000 or the French below 3,000,000. This means that the Germans have been losing at the rate of 150,000 a month since the start and the French at least at the rate of 110,000.

Up to the present time German losses are figured at 4,000,000, French at 3,000,000, Austrian at 4,000,000 and Russian at 6,000,000, all but the last a minimum. The last is the estimate of the Germans. By comparison a British loss of 1,100,000 must be reckoned very low. Expressed in terms of percentage, German casualties represent 6 per cent of the German population, French 7½ per cent, Russian 3.1-3 per cent and British 2 per cent. Clearly the British have got off more lightly than any of the great powers, save the Italians, and the Italians did not begin fighting until many months after British losses began.

Of British losses we may say this, then: they are now approximately at the level that will continue, if the British army is to continue to play an effective part on the Continental battle ground. During two years of the war the French have contributed far more than their share of the casualties on the Western front. They have done this because, in the nature of things, the British could not in this time put an army in the field. It became the mission of France to hold while Britain prepared. The result is shown in a loss of 3,000,000 for France and 1,000,000 for Britain in total casualties.

Despite the words of Hindenburg, French man-power is not exhausted, and Joffre the other day affirmed that the French had more troops in line than in the early months of the war. But French man-power would be exhausted if France were compelled to lose for two years more at

the rate of the past two years. This will not happen. More and more the British will take over sectors on the Western front, but in doing this they will steadily expand their casualties.

Henceforth we shall see British loss increase rather than diminish. Next year, when the British army is expected to reach a real state of efficiency—and it has made marked progress this summer—the fighting that is expected will probably bring British losses per month well above 150,000. In the same time we may look for a corresponding diminution in French losses. The Western Allies are fighting Germany in relays, and it is Britain's turn. In the next two years the British losses will hardly fall below 3,000,000.

The combined French and British population, without regard to colonies, was about 85,000,000 when the war began; the German about 67,000,000. If Germany were only called upon to face these two nations, her man-power would still be inferior. But she has also to keep armies before Russia and in the Balkans. Actually, her losses, while not equal to the French, Russian and British, cannot have been inferior to those of the British and French, which are about 4,100,000—the minimum figure.

Unfortunately the Anglo-French losses have not been divided equally—France has borne three-quarters of them. But the time has now come for the British to "carry on," and their losses in the past four months, equalling as they do the total British loss for the first year of the war, are an evidence of British willingness to "do her bit."

As for the four months of British casualties, they are but a drop in the bucket when one recalls that the total casualties for all nations for the first two years were not less than 18,500,000, and the total killed at least 4,500,000. Beside these figures a loss for four months of 415,000, terrible as it seems by comparison with past wars, is of little real meaning.

**An Undivided Port**

The Interstate Commerce Commission has granted the petition of the State of New York, represented by Mr. Julius Henry Cohen as special Deputy Attorney General, and of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York to intervene in the action brought by the State of New Jersey and various municipalities to divide the Port of New York as a freight zone. The City of New York, through Mr. Wickersham; the Merchants' Association and other commercial bodies also are seeking the right to become parties to this action, which is brought against a group of railways. Whether or not they all obtain a legal standing in the case, the fact remains that the State and City of New York and the commercial bodies thereof will be united in their protest against the course proposed by the communities across the river.

This complaint demands a reorganization and readjustment of the Port of New York such as "to put into intensive use all the natural conditions and give to the New Jersey side advantages which nature has provided." That is, New Jersey wants an advantage in freight rates against New York amounting, approximately, to the lighterage charges on goods which have to be transported to the terminals on this side of the harbor. At present the same rate is given to New Jersey cities within the New York zone as is given to this city. This seems to them to be an injustice, and they seek to relieve themselves of its burden. But what they propose would be a far greater injustice to New York State and the City of New York, the great shipping port of the country.

As the complaint recites, New Jersey had from nature great advantages. But New Jersey and her nearby cities for years neglected these advantages. While New York has been developing her side of the wonderful harbor which is the joint property of the neighboring states, New Jersey has stood still until recently. The other side of the river is underdeveloped as to pier facilities. Most of the desirable waterfront has been turned over to private interests. Railroad yards, ferry terminals, coal piers, privately built, privately owned, occupy it. New York early in its history also barred away its valuable waterfront, but for many years has been requiring title to what had been alienated. More than one hundred million dollars has been spent in developing its waterfront. The Chelsea piers are a notable instance of waterfront development. Vast barge canal terminals are planned, to cost nearly \$10,000,000, while \$1,000,000 has been appropriated by the city for improvements in Jamaica Bay. Private interests have given thought and money to the improvement of New York's section of the harbor as no part of the New Jersey section of the port is improved, with the possible exception of some 2,500 feet of waterfront occupied by the Dutch and German steamship piers. There is probably no finer development in the world than the Bush Terminal, in South Brooklyn.

All this activity, state, municipal, private, has been based and founded on the conception of an indivisible Port of New York, embodied in the existing freight zone and freight rates. To grant the petition of New Jersey would not alone strike a tremendous blow at the commercial prosperity of this city and state; it would disorganize the business of the country. And it is greatly to be questioned whether the material advantages to New Jersey would be as great as advocates of this plan seem to think. Inevitably there would be competition between the two sides of the harbor—a competition in which New Jersey would start handicapped and for which her resources assuredly could not be ranked against this state's.

At present New Jersey derives benefit from the freight zone system. The vast quantity of New York traffic has produced low rates, which the New Jersey cities share with New York. Considering their interest as well as the interest of this city and state, a continuance of the existing cooperation seems infinitely to be preferred to a cut-throat competition which would array the two sides of the harbor against each other. New Jersey, as the petitioner or complainant in this action, has to prove the merits of the proposed change. It will be hard to bring out convincing proof.

**"Archie" Fowler**

It is one of the ironies of the newspaper business that those who are most useful and most successful within their profession are precisely the men who are least known to the thousands and hundreds of thousands whom they serve. No better illustration of this can be found, perhaps, than in the case of "Archie" Fowler, of "The Sun" staff, whose death occurred on Tuesday.

In the past twenty years a very large fraction of the men who have achieved success in the magazine field, whose names have become familiar to the periodical reading public, have worked on "The Sun" and drawn from it the advantages in training and spirit which were a part of the continuing tradition of that newspaper, and have then passed from this training school into a field which gave them wider notice and conceivably greater financial return.

Yet, despite the common notion, these were not the men who "made 'The New York Sun.'" The men who did this were the men of "Archie" Fowler's kind, who rose slowly or swiftly from one post to another because of their capacity for accurate, intelligent, painstaking work. They were the men who did not make mistakes and did get the news. They were the men for whom their profession was not a way station or stepping stone. They were the men to whom the business of getting and writing the news had a sufficing appeal.

There are many men doing on many newspapers the thing that Mr. Fowler did for so long upon "The Sun." Some of them are doing it as well, perhaps; none are doing it better. They have for their work a love and a loyalty which in some fashion the newspaper business commands as its demand. They are not men to the millions that read them, who are served by them, but they are the foundations upon which all newspapers are erected, and without them all else in the newspaper world is nothing.

No man was better known within his profession than "Archie" Fowler, and his death is a real loss to the newspaper world.

**"An Uneventful Voyage"**

It is evident that Germany's foes were not wholly ignorant of the Deutschland's movements, for it was given out nearly a week ago by British agents in this country that she might be expected at New London about Wednesday. And duly on Wednesday morning she arrived there after what is described as "quite an uneventful voyage."

It may well be that ultimately the submarine service may come to be more or less regular. In the mean time it is a precarious and but relatively profitable enterprise. It is true, indeed, that the value of the cargo, according to all accounts, is more than sufficient to justify the cost, and the profits are of course immeasurably greater than in normal transatlantic traffic. But then, the risks are far greater, and the capacity even of the most modern of submarines is extremely limited.

The loss of the Bremen is now admitted by the agents of the German company, though it is strenuously denied that she was captured or sunk by the enemy. The grounds for confidence on this point are insufficient. It is said that if she had been taken the British Admiralty would surely have made the fact known at once, but that is by no means certain. On the contrary, it is clear that for reasons best known to themselves the Admiralty are singularly reticent with regard to anti-submarine operations, rarely giving out information except when it is obviously already in German hands.

This seems, indeed, to be true of most other naval events. It may be recalled, for instance, that nearly a month passed before we heard anything of the sinking of the raider Greif; and it was plainly intimated at the time that the news was published then only because it was certain that the Germans had already

been informed of the affair. Other indications of obscure naval activities are not wanting. About three weeks ago Mr. Asquith made a statement in the House of Commons about German prisoners. The naval figures as compared with the figures given out last July show an increase of more than 650, yet no official announcement to account for this increase has been made in the last three months.

It would be imprudent to draw conclusions from such circumstances as these, but they seem at least to imply a certain secrecy in the prosecution of the war at sea. In any case it is well known that the policy of the Admiralty in the matter of submarines is to keep the Germans as much in the dark as possible, and there is no reason to suppose that this policy does not apply as well to merchantmen as to others. Hence the fate of the Bremen must still remain a mystery.

**A MULTIPLE PERSONALITY?**

**One Explanation of President Wilson's Many Minds**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I see by The Tribune that Dr. Hyslop reports the existence of a girl with five personalities. I should like to call Dr. Hyslop's attention to the extraordinary case of our President.

It seems to me clear that there are in his case six personalities at least: The Wilson who would not be frightened in 1914 by nervous persons, the Wilson who in 1916 thought we should have "incomparably the greatest navy in the world," the Wilson who wrote the "strict accountability" and "omit no word or act" notes, the Wilson who allowed the destruction of the Lusitania and other ships, with the loss of many American lives, for which no settlement has yet been made; the Wilson who has twice made war on Mexico and the Wilson who "kept us out of war."

Perhaps we might add the Wilson who wanted Bryan knocked into a cocked hat and the Wilson who appointed Bryan Secretary of State.

C. R. N.  
Caldwell, N. J., Oct. 30, 1916.

**Why He Had to Drop Wilson**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In business in foreign countries I often saw with shame the inferiority of our diplomatic and consular representatives, until Roosevelt raised the standard of the service. Mr. Wilson allowed Mr. Bryan to push out capable and experienced men and put in men of lower grade, of no experience and possessing only enough knowledge of the languages of the countries to which they were accredited to give the natives a good laugh.

Mr. Wilson chose as Secretary of the Navy a man whose arrogance and incompetence tended terribly to discourage and its inevitable concomitant, inefficiency, in our navy; and in spite of the practically unanimous protest of all non-partisan periodicals Mr. Daniels is still there.

Mr. Wilson told the nations of Europe that we were too proud to fight. An individual may say that of himself, for the law will fight for him, but a nation must fight its own battles or perish. To a people influenced by a man or men who try to shield timidity under a pretence of pride, the words of Goldsmith well apply:

"Cursed be the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Whose wealth accumulates and men decay."

S. N. STEWART.  
Brooklyn, Oct. 29, 1916.

**A Question of Moors**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: At the time of the sinking of the Sussex this country suddenly realized that unless we expressed ourselves immediately and strongly this administration would plunge us into war. The whole country was shocked. Tens of thousands of telegrams and letters poured into Washington urging the Congress to "Keep us out of this European war. There are too many in it now."

Congress saw the light, and it was Congress which "kept us out of war." At that time President Wilson stated that "I am in a fighting mood."

Now his only hope of reelection is through the reiterated claim that "He kept us out of war."

If reelected, which he will not be, how do we know that within a week he would not again be "in a fighting mood?"

I predict that this country does not want "a moody President," but will elect a President of balanced principles.

AN EX-WILSON DEMOCRAT.  
New York, Nov. 1, 1916.

**In Mr. Baker's Defence**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: We can't make history and shouldn't make votes by misrepresentation.

As to Secretary Baker's statement regarding the soldiers of Valley Forge—those patriots of undying fame—what was wrong? What charge did he make that cannot be substantiated by the recorded history of those terrible times? That his speech was ill timed politically we may, perhaps, allow, but who is there that does not admit that starvation knows no law but self-preservation, and will take as a right whatever is within reach to feed its hunger and quench its thirst?

Where were there ever soldiers, cold and famished, dying for lack of sustenance, who did not do it?

And what more did Newton D. Baker say than that?

GEORGE W. COOK.  
Tarrytown, N. Y., Oct. 31, 1916.

**To an Old Love**

O, the white chalk cliffs of England that rise along the sea;  
O, the vast green downs that lure me where the silver dew ponds be;  
O, the moorlands red with heather that bloom in the early fall;  
O, the joy of an English morning, with the blue sky over all!

O, land amid the waters; O, heart of the world's delight!  
O, downs and heathery moorlands; O, chalky cliffs so white!  
Blessed be they that love you, and curse the day that hate,  
And strength be to your sons that turn the battle at the gate!

ROBERT LEET PATTERSON.

**THE SOCIALIST VIEW**

**Wilson Administration Is No More Progressive Than Taft**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A number of so-called radicals in this campaign are stating that radicals should support the Democratic ticket rather than the Socialist ticket because of the fundamental difference between the social philosophy of Mr. Wilson and that of Mr. Hughes. This, they argue, is so great as to warrant a genuine radical to do all in his power to ward off the catastrophe that would inevitably follow a Republican victory.

If we study the social legislation that has been passed in the last decade we are forced to the conclusion that the social and economic development of the country is at present that some progressive legislation is to be expected under any administration. Take, for instance, the administration of Mr. Taft. Few will accuse that gentleman of an excessive liking for progressive legislation. Yet we find that during his four years in office such measures were passed as the parcel post, the Postal Savings Bank law, the Bureau of Mines, the Department of Labor, the Children's Bureau, the Bureau of Commerce, the Eight-Hour law for employees of contractors doing work for the United States Government, the Child Labor law for the District of Columbia, the Anti-Gag law, the income tax amendment to the Constitution, the amendment to the Constitution permitting popular election of United States Senators, and similar measures.

Mr. Wilson realized that there was a huge progressive sentiment in the country. He realized that if he was to hope for a second term he would have to cater to that progressive sentiment. And yet, in spite of this state of affairs, we see very little really fundamental legislation passed under the Wilson regime. We do not see at this time, when other nations are raising their income and inheritance taxes by leaps and bounds, any radical increase in the forms of taxation. We do not see any advocacy of the minimum wage law. We do not witness any enthusiastic support of public ownership of such utilities as the railroads, of genuine social insurance acts against old age, accidents or sickness. These measures have been placed into operation already by many nations of the world. All of them have been practically ignored by the Wilson administration.

We have, of course, the Child Labor law. We are grateful for this, but we must realize that this legislation was not originally on the Democratic programme and that it was only when the President began to receive thousands of telegrams from various parts of the country vigorously protesting against the omission of this measure from the tentative programme that he gave consideration. We have the Eight-Hour law. However, it must be realized that the eight-hour agitation was not begun by Mr. Wilson, but by the brotherhoods of railway employees.

The President's policy of segregating the colored people in governmental employment from the white employees has, according to students of the subject, greatly complicated the negro problem and hindered the development of the colored people in many ways. He has left the bars down on the question of conservation, has supported the Shreveport bill, which would give certain water powers of the country to certain interests forever and for nothing, and has in this field encouraged the forces of reaction. He has been compelled to cater to politicians by disregarding the Civil Service rules and by appointing men of inferior mentality to responsible positions. By acceding to the demands of the militarists and favoring an appropriation for army and navy purposes \$200,000,000 greater than that appropriated by any other country in time of peace, he has given consciously or unconsciously a great impetus to the military spirit of this country.

From the standpoint of mildly progressive legislation there will not be much difference between a Republican and a Democratic administration. We must also realize that from the standpoint of genuinely radical legislation there will be little difference, for neither candidate or party stands for any programme which in any vital way leads to a fundamental redistribution of wealth, which in any vital way leads to the abolition of poverty and to the securing to the laborer the product of his toil. That is the most important problem before the American people. That problem neither the Republican nor the Democratic party has touched. From the standpoint of the worker the success of either of the Republican or Democratic party will be a calamity. From the standpoint of the worker the only thing that will count in this campaign will be the strengthening of the one party—the Socialist party—which is fighting persistently for the abolition of poverty, the abolition of class war, the securing of genuine equality of opportunity, of real democracy, of free freedom.

HARRY W. LAIDLER.  
New York, Oct. 31, 1916.

**Following Roosevelt**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: By far the most important issues of the present Presidential campaign are Americanism and preparedness. Colonel Roosevelt, bold, constructive and far-seeing statesman, has done more to rouse this patriotic and mammoth army of men in the United States than any other man has taken to rouse "America First and America Efficient."

In justice, therefore, to the Sage of Sagamore Hill, who himself will not receive the fruits of his endeavors in re-election to the office which in time past he filled so ably, the intelligent, discriminating, honoring and duty-performing ballot casters of this mighty nation should give all means for his candidate, Charles E. Hughes, one who has been tried and found worthy; who says what he means and means what he says; who is peace-seeking without being pacifistic; conservative without being reactionary; safe without being slow; courageous without being jingoistic; and law-executing without being statute-improvising—the one hundred per cent American, Mr. Charles E. Hughes.

Evans Hughes is a better man.

H. W. ARNOLD.  
Pascagoula, Miss., Oct. 25, 1916.

**Reason for a Change**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The posters now adorning our subway and elevated stations in the present publicity campaign of the Democratic party should be changed to read as follows:

WILSON'S NOT THE MAN.  
We are happy in a fool's paradise. We are busy making war munitions. We have peace with dishonor. We have prosperity soaked in the blood of Europe. Why change? Because Charles Evans Hughes is a better man.

H. W. ARNOLD.  
New York, Nov. 1, 1916.

**DEMOCRACY'S BID FOR THE WORKER**

**Peace, Prosperity and Friendship for Labor the Basis of the President's Campaign—His Record of Instability Casts Doubt on His Capacity for Leadership**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Democratic bid for the wage-earner's vote is a direct appeal to his self-interest. It is becoming more and more a controlling issue of the campaign. The wage-earner is always strongly influenced by favorable existing conditions, because he is the first to feel any disturbance of them. He is not unattracted, but it is natural that the compelling issues should be those which touch his life most closely. When he has made his mind up as to these he is more ready to consider questions which concern the general welfare.

The Democratic party asks to be continued in power because it has kept the country out of war, because it has proved itself to be the friend of labor and because it has brought about a period of great prosperity. This is not its whole case. But its special appeal to the wage earner is: Peace, prosperity and friendship for labor.

The claim for credit for keeping us out of war is not to be confused with the question whether the President is to be held accountable for needless loss of American life and a surrender of national honor. On that issue it rests with the people who criticize the President to prove their case, to show that when the Falaba was torpedoed, in March, 1915, with loss of American life, a threat to sever diplomatic relations unless the act was promptly disavowed and reparation made would have prevented the Lusitania and subsequent disasters, or that the probabilities at the time were that such would be the effect of an ultimatum.

The question we are considering is not whether the President adopted the best plan, but rather whether Mr. Hughes, if he had been President, would have been likely to adopt a different plan, and in such case whether his plan would have brought war. The President can hardly claim special credit for keeping us out of war, if we would have been kept out anyway. He may have thought war imminent. If, in fact, it was not, the President is within his rights in seeking to justify his course of action as warranted by the probabilities at the time, it is a different matter to assert that war would have come otherwise. The burden rests on the Administration to prove its case. How can it prove that the President's plan was the only way to avert war?

The Democratic party also claims to be the friend of labor. It is difficult to account for the President's attitude with respect to the threatened strike except on the ground of expediency. To do otherwise would be to challenge his intelligence.

The question, vital to democracy, was whether arbitration as a principle shall be sacrificed in settling disputes at the dictation of one side to the controversy.

The question for the laboring man to decide is not merely whether in the long run the abandonment of the principle of arbitration is really an act of friendship toward him, but whether a President who now submits to dictation on the plea of necessity can be trusted to stand courageously for principle in the interest of labor, if at some future time expediency tempts him the other way.

If we have been kept out of war not because of what the Administration has done, but in spite of its mistakes, it is much the same with regard to present prosperity. Mr. Taft has given us a sound statement of the case as can be found in the exposure of the arrogance of the Administration in claiming the credit for present prosperity which has been caused, as he says, "by the protection that the war has afforded to our industries by neutralizing the injurious effect which the Underwood

tariff would have had in normal times." He reminds us that in the ten months of that tariff, before the war began in August, 1914, it accomplished none of the things it was supposed to do. It did not increase our foreign trade. Exports shrank \$159,000,000, as compared with the ten months of the previous year, and imports increased \$102,000,000. It was claimed that business would not be disturbed, but railroads went into the hands of receivers, factories all over the country were running on 60 per cent time, and it was estimated that 2,000,000 wage-earners were unemployed. All this despite good crops which must greatly have helped out the situation. Development was arrested.

The test will come when the war is over—when the tariff protection artificially furnished by war conditions is removed. Then less than at any time in our history will American industry be able to compete against the cheap cost of production abroad. The Republican party stands for a tariff at least adequate to pay the expenses of government and to protect labor. Let the wage-earner bear this in mind when his vote is solicited on the ground of prosperity.

The vital question for the wage-earner is not so much whether we now have peace and prosperity, but what assurance we have against war and economic depression in the perilous period ahead of us. We cannot in fairness deny that the President has stood for real progress in many matters of domestic concern nor that laws have been enacted during his administration, notwithstanding Republican origin as to some of their best features, which are constructive in character and will benefit the country. But in great problems growing out of the European war and our relations with a turbulent near neighbor, in matters vital to our integrity as a nation on account of the insidious dangers which threaten us so long as divided allegiance is tolerated, in emergencies like that created by the threatened strike, has the President shown the best vision, the greatest conviction and unflinching essential to leadership in times of stress and storm?

With the example of the great war before him he spoke of preparedness as a symptom of nervous excitability and saw the light on that great issue only after his eyes had been fairly pried open for him by an aroused public sentiment. We are to-day as unprepared as we were three years ago. Announcing a policy of watchful waiting, he has not waited the best thing to do, but he has waited a minute to interfere actively in the internal affairs of Mexico, leaving that unfortunate country to-day in a state of bankruptcy, suffering and lawlessness such as it has never known, and our own problems with respect to it infinitely more difficult of solution. During all this period of vacillation he did nothing to increase the efficiency of the regular army, so that when we came to the very edge of war with Mexico he had to call out the National Guard and take thousands of young men for a service for which they were totally unfitted.

The President may have had the most honorable intentions. But the question is not so much whether he has done the best he knew how, but whether he has done the best there was to do. Can we trust his judgment to reverse himself on questions of vital concern to the country? May we not question his capacity to lead when we find him hesitating in a crisis, preferring to side-step or postpone an issue instead of meeting it courageously?

LEIGHTON C. CHASE.  
Plainfield, N. J., Oct. 31, 1916.

**THE FARCE IN MEXICO**

**Woodrow Wilson's Persistent War Against Common Sense**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In The New York Tribune for June 8th ult. a letter by me entitled "Arbitration in Mexico: A Southern Democrat Questions Its Use Under Existing Circumstances," was published, and in it I made the statement that for this Administration to make a treaty of arbitration with the Carranza government without first having sufficient guarantees that Carranza or the people of Mexico would or could carry out the terms of the award in case the court decided adversely to them was "brutal force," and that it persisted in "feeling less to serious international complications."

The trend of events, as they appear in the paper to-day, seems to justify the position taken by me and by The Tribune. It is to be wondered where our country would be to-day had such an angleworm course been followed in the past. Suppose the following notes had been sent:

"Commander of the Minute Men to General Gage, after the Boston Massacre:

"Your men, now invaders on our soil, have fired upon and slain seven American citizens, and have wounded several more. While we do not mean to resist such infamy with violence, our fervent desire being for peace, we desire to point out that from a humanitarian standpoint your measures are brutal, and we therefore suggest it advisable for you to withdraw your troops at once."

John Paul Jones to the commander of the British frigate Serapis:

"Kindly refrain from firing upon my ship, the Bon Homme Richard, as we are willing to surrender in order to save human lives, and particularly if you will regard this done from a friendly spirit and not from cowardice. It is desired by the government of the United States to avoid fighting when honorable terms can be arranged."

American government to England after the burning of the national capital:

"The British government has committed a dastardly outrage upon the City of Washington. Please find bill inclosed. You will see we have no intention of prolonging the war to collect the costs, but a refusal to pay will be regarded with disfavor, even if not as an unfriendly act."

Roosevelt to the Kaiser in the Venezuela dispute:

"Your country is attempting to violate the Monroe Doctrine in Venezuela from a moral standpoint entirely unjustified, and I desire to point out the danger which may follow a persistence in such a course. I do not mean by this that war may follow, but no mining of words can conceal that it will cause among the people of the United States a feeling of indignation which may result in an embargo on cotton to your ports. If the German government refuses to withdraw from South America it will be regarded as an unkind act."

"P. S.—The threat about the cotton is for home consumption; we will be glad to ship you all you need."

R. H.  
Syracuse, N. Y., Oct. 31, 1916.

**SOME HISTORIC NOTES**

**Rewritten According to Mr. Wilson's Epistolary Style**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The present Administration has reached such a burlesque of policy that it is to be wondered where our country would be to-day had such an angleworm course been followed in the past. Suppose the following notes had been sent:

"Commander of the Minute Men to General Gage, after the Boston Massacre:

"Your men, now invaders on our soil, have fired upon and slain seven American citizens, and have wounded several more. While we do not mean to resist such infamy with violence, our fervent desire being for peace, we desire to point out that from a humanitarian standpoint your measures are brutal, and we therefore suggest it advisable for you to withdraw your troops at once."

John Paul Jones to the commander of the British frigate Serapis:

"Kindly refrain from firing upon my ship, the Bon Homme Richard, as we are willing to surrender in order to save human lives, and particularly if you will regard this done from a friendly spirit and not from cowardice. It is desired by the government of the United States to avoid fighting when honorable